

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 14, 19, 21 and 22 are currently being amended.

Claims 23 and 24 are currently being added.

This amendment amends and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and adding the claims as set forth above, claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

Interview at PTO:

Applicant's representative appreciates the courtesies extended to him by Examiner Nguyen, during a telephone interview conducted on Thursday, February 16, 2006. During that interview, the indefiniteness rejection of the claims was discussed, and the prior art (Eichstadt) was discussed, whereby Applicants' representative stated that the 'alias' feature of the present claims is not disclosed or suggested by Eichstadt.

Double Patenting Rejection:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 11, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 8, 5, 11, 14 and 15 of copending Application No. 10/629,594; claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 6 and 12 of copending Application No. 10/629,594; claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 7 and 13 of copending Application No. 10/629,594;

claims 7 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 3 and 9 of copending Application No. 10/629,594; claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 8, 14 and 15 of copending Application No. 10/629,594; and claims 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 2 of copending Application No. 10/629,594. In accordance with the M.P.E.P., Applicant respectfully requests deferral of these rejections until either this application of Application No. 10/629,594 is allowed. In any event, the claims have been amended to claim a different invention than that claimed in Application No. 10/629,594.

Claim Rejections – Indefiniteness:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7-8, 10, 12, 14-15 and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, since “The inventor does not explain what is the predetermined address at the client, same as predetermined criterion, predetermined period of time and step.” Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. However, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the displaying step displays the address of the server on which the copy of the sub-page is hosted. Accordingly, there is nothing indefinite about the features recited in claim 1.

As to “predetermined step”, that feature is explained in the specification, and also in claim 8, whereby it may correspond to “completion of a connection with a server.” As to “predetermined criterion”, that feature is explained in the specification, and also in claim 10, whereby it may correspond to “the greatest progress in establishing full connection with one of the servers after a specified interval of time following simultaneous actuation of all links.” As to “predetermined address”, claim 12 clearly recites that this may correspond to “an address of a further server hosting a copy of the sub-page.” As to “predetermined time”, that clearly represents a time period that has been previously set, such as by a user or by some other entity. For example, when a link is selected to go to a web page, the time from when the link was selected to a predetermined time is counted, whereby that predetermined time is

reached (thereby signifying a problem with accessing that link), another link is then automatically selected. This is fully explained in the specification, and is readily understandable by one skilled in the art.

None of the above features is indefinite, and if this indefiniteness rejection is maintained by the Examiner, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the basis for this rejection in more detail. Please note that it not required that claims 'explain' anything, but rather it is requested that they just provide a clear description of the claimed invention, which has been done with respect to the presently pending claims.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0023754 to Eichstadt. This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons given below.

Eichstadt is directed to the insertion of scripts in web pages before transmission, in order to enhance functionality. This has nothing at all to do with the subject matter of the claimed invention. Rather, Eichstadt discloses links to another web page in a web page, which is not what is being claimed in the presently pending claims.

More particularly, Eichstadt does not disclose or suggest the displaying of an alias for the address of the server on which a copy of a sub-page is hosted.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Eichstadt.

For similar reasons, presently pending independent claims 11, 21 and 22 are not anticipated by Eichstadt. Presently pending independent claim 22 is further distinguishable from Eichstadt in that it recites that the alias corresponds to a first URL that is different from a second URL corresponding to the address of the further server on which the copy of the sub-page is hosted. Such features are not disclosed,

taught or suggested by Eichstadt.

In any event, the presently pending independent claims have been amended to more distinctly recite the present invention, in order that it should be clear that those claimed features are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Eichstadt.

The presently pending dependent claims under rejection are patentable due to the specific features recited in those claims, as well as for the reasons provided above for their respective base claim.

For example, claim 2 recites that a plurality of links are provided, each being a different address of a server on which a copy of the sub-page is hosted. Page 6, paragraph 42 of Eichstadt (cited in the Office Action against claim 2), on the other hand, merely describes a browser interface which has a toolbar that enables a user to join a session using a username/password. This has nothing at all to do with the features recited in claim 2. Claim 12 recites similar features to those recited in claim 2, and thus claim 12 is also patentable over the teachings of Eichstadt.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite that the alias corresponds to a first URL that is different from a second URL corresponding to the address of the server on which the copy of the sub-page is hosted. This is explained, for example, on page 6 of the specification, with a particular example. Page 4, paragraph 31 of Eichstadt (cited in the Office Action against claim 4), on the other hand, merely describes Internet browser software that provides at least one browser window for viewing and displaying web-pages received by the client's computer via a network. This has nothing at all to do with the features recited in claim 4.

Claim 5 recites that a predetermined criteria is used to determine which of a plurality of links is to be actuated. Page 4, paragraph 32 of Eichstadt (cited in the Office Action against claim 5), on the other hand, merely describes that, when a user requests a web-page from a server, the user is permitted to join a session based on a comparison of the user's cookie. It also describes that script code is used to monitor's the user's cursor movement and the status of the Internet browser window. This has

nothing at all to do with the features recited in claim 5. Claim 14 recites similar features to those recited in claim 5, and thus claim 14 is also patentable over the teachings of Eichstadt.

Claim 9 recites that each of the links is actuated simultaneously, and that one of the links is selected based on a predetermined criterion (e.g., such as the first link that provides data back to the client, such as recited in claim 10). Page 5, paragraph 35 of Eichstadt (cited in the Office Action against claim 5), on the other hand, merely describes that a server retrieves a web-page and downloads that web-page to a client computer, and when the user select a hypertext link, the server receives that request and communicates a modified web-page to the client computer. This has nothing at all to do with the features recited in claim 9 (and claim 10, which depends from claim 9). Claim 19 recites similar features to those recited in claim 9, and thus claim 19 is also patentable over the teachings of Eichstadt.

New Claims:

New claims 23 and 24 have been added to recite additional features of the present invention that are believed to provide a separate basis of patentability for these claims, beyond the reasons given above for their base claim and intervening claims.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated,

otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date *February 17, 2006*

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer Number: 022879

By *Phillip J. Articola*

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,819

Telephone No.: (202) 672-5300